

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 9-19 and 21 are cancelled. Claims 1-8, 20 and 22-28 remain in this application and, as amended herein, are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

In the Office Action, claims 1-9 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Klug (U.S. Patent No. 6,823,327). Applicant submits that the claims are patentably distinguishable over Klug.

The present Office Action repeats the rejection set out in the October 20, 2006 Office Action but fails to address the arguments set out in the Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. 1.116 dated January 22, 2007. Rather, the present Office Action merely recites the claims as amended in the January 22, 2007 Amendment with the same cited sections of Klug that were set out in the prior Office Action. As the pointed out in the M.P.E.P.:

Where the applicant traverses any rejection, the examiner should, if he or she repeats the rejection, take note of the applicant's argument and answer the substance of it. (Emphasis added.)

(M.P.E.P. § 707.07(f).) Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner respond to the substance of Applicant's arguments.

The Examiner incorrectly argues that Klug teaches the generation source identifier storage means defined in claim 1 and refers to column 2, lines 14-15 and 41-45 and to column 9, lines 45-67 of Klug. The relied on sections of Klug merely describe a common user ID that can be used to access a plurality of web sites. When a user wishes to register at a new third party web site, the user provides the new third party web site with the common user ID for a registration web site by which the new third party web site obtains further user information from

the registration web site. (See col. 2 ll. 14-15.) Klug, however, also describes that:

...[I]f a determination is made that sufficient registration information has been received at the registrar web site 100, the user's registration information is stored in the user registration information database 144 (step 236) and subsequently a registrar application 128 outputs a request to the user to select a user ID and password that can be at least used to access the users registration information at the registrar web site 100 (step 240). (Emphasis added.)

(Col.8 ll.5-9, see also Fig.2 Box 240.) Namely, Klug teaches that the common user ID is assigned to the registration web site by the user. Klug does not disclose or suggest that the common user ID is assigned to the registration web site by a third party web site.

The relied on sections of Klug also describe a second embodiment in which a user may register by completing a form provided by a third party web site. The third party web site then sends a request to the registration web site to register the user at to the registration web site. (See col.9 ll. 45-67.) However, Klug next describes:

...Subsequently, in step 428 the steps of FIGS. 2A and 2B are performed for registering the user at the registrar web site 100.

(Col.9 l.66 - col.10 l.1.) Namely, Klug again teaches that the common user ID is assigned to the registration web site by the user and neither discloses nor suggests that the common user ID is assigned to the registration web site by a third party web site.

Hence, Klug does not disclose or suggest:

generation source identifier storage means for storing a generation source identifier that is assigned to said information processing apparatus by the external apparatus and which is provided by the

external apparatus, the generation source identifier identifying said information processing apparatus as generation source of the user identifier as called for in claim 1. (Emphasis added.)

It follows that Klug neither discloses nor suggests the combination set out in claim 1 and therefore does not anticipate the claim.

Claims 2-8 each depend from claim 1 and each is therefore distinguishable over the cited reference for at the same reasons.

Independent claim 20 includes limitations similar to those of claim 1. Therefore claim 20 is patentably distinguishable over Klug for at least the same reasons.

Claims 22-28 each depend from claim 20, and each is therefore distinguishable over the cited reference for at the same reasons.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

Application No.: 09/781,496

Docket No.: SONYJP 3.0-748

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: June 12, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

BY Lawrence E. Russ

Lawrence E. Russ

Registration No.: 35,342

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant

772233_1.DOC